Ideologies of English in Asia: an editorial

Alexandra Grey, University of Technology Sydney, Faculty of Law, Ultimo NSW 2007, Australia. Corresponding author for this article: alexandra.grey@uts.edu.au

Loy Lising, Macquarie University, Department of Linguistics, Faculty of Medicine, Health and Human Sciences, NSW 2109, Australia.

Jinhyun Cho, Macquarie University, Department of Linguistics, Faculty of Medicine, Health and Human Sciences, NSW 2109, Australia.

Abstract:

That English has spread in Asia is well-known, but this critical reflection, and the five contributions and book review that we hereby introduce, contribute to rectifying the relative absence in the sociology of language literature of studies approaching language ideologies and practices in specific Asian contexts from local perspectives. We are not alone; our inspections of journal archives show that scholars are increasingly responding to this relative absence in recent years. What this special issue offers is further diversity of both authors and cases, and moreover this special issue draws attention to the immutable, binary structure underlying the various globally-circulating discourses of the East and the West as part of investigating how socially constructed East-West binaries interact with language ideologies about English and other languages. It shifts the attention from fixity – East versus West – to diversity, extending East to Easts and West to Wests as our contributors identify and examine multiple, endogenous "imaginative geograph[ies]" (Dirlik's 1996: 97) constructed through various Orientalist ideologies. It founds this approach on a combination of Irvine and Gal's (2000) theory of recursive language ideologies and the critical Orientalism scholarship of Said (1978), Chen (1992) and Dirlik (1996). This is generative of new and useful sociolinguistic analyses. Having laid out this theoretical extension, this editorial then provides an overview of the issue's contributions, which examine how socially constructed East-West binaries are interacting with language ideologies about English and other languages on sub-national scales in various Asian contexts including in Korea, China, Japan, Tajikistan and Pakistan.

Keywords: World Englishes; Orientalism; self-Orientalism; internal colonialism; recursive language ideology.

1. The Theoretical Inheritance and Innovation of this Special Issue

The point of this editorial and special issue is to draw attention to the immutable, binary structure underlying the various globally-circulating discourses of the East and the West as part of investigating how socially constructed East-West binaries are interacting with language ideologies about English and other languages in various Asian contexts. The aim is not to showcase diverse ideologies of English in Asia merely to prove that such diversity exists, although we believe that showcasing this diversity, and these diverse authors, is important within academic discourses. We are interested in bringing forth bottom-up approaches and discourses that shift the attention from fixity – East versus West – to diversity, extending East to Easts and West to Wests, and in spurring further scholarship in reply. There is not one singular reason for this pluralization of East to Easts and West to Wests, and indeed we contend that it has always been there for the looking if one were to investigate different scales. Our contributors draw out various sociopolitical, economic and ideological conditions producing the plurality of Easts and Wests, examining how English is used to construct them, and how English is co-constructed by them.

The five contributions could each be summarised with a phrase Brook Bolander (this issue: X) uses to describe her own findings about English: "ownership of English [is] polysemous". To amplify an important implication of this which Bolander herself explicitly points out (pX), we should not, as some academic authors do, start from the assumption that English *is* Western (see further Grey and Baioud this issue: X). Yet English is often (by general people and linguists) spoken about as if it falls inherently on the Western side of a divide; this default position is reproduced in many studies about English language, including in studies of non-Western contexts (e.g. Gao 2009). In our view, this occurs on both sides of the global English/linguistic imperialism debate where on the one hand, English is viewed positively as a linguistic tool that enriches local language ecologies and serves to bridge the linguistic diversity in the region (see Bolton 2000, 2008; Kirkpatrick 2008, 2010; Hung 2002; Wee, Lim and Goh 2013), while on the other hand, it is seen negatively as a hegemonic tool that undermines indigenous languages (see Park and Wee 2008; Tupas 2004, 2008, 2016). However, it is our contention, following social constructionist theory, that the East and the West are not (only) geographic regions but ideological concepts reproduced through discourses and social structures. (Readers unfamiliar with this approach may wish to read Anderson's [1991] key work on "imagined communities" and Dirlik [1996], which we introduce further below.) Our special issue thus presents studies of East-West divisions being

embraced, negotiated and, at times, erased in the construction of distinct language hierarchies and distinct places. Thus, our contributors are united in exposing the role of East-West binaries in ideological processes through which English is used to make socially meaningful distinctions between places and to make certain groupings of peoples socially meaningful and in place within them.

The theoretical germ from which this special issue has grown is the development, outside sociolinguistics, of theories critiquing Orientalism and the resonance we see between such scholarship and the sociolinguist theorization of recursive language ideologies originating with Irvine and Gal. Irvine and Gal (2000: 38) theorize recursivity as an archetypal language ideological process by which hierarchic beliefs about social differences are overlaid onto linguistic differences (or vice versa). This lens of language ideology focuses, for us, a perspective on Said's (1978) landmark critique of Orientalism and two important extensions of his work, Xiaomei Chen's (1992) *Occidentalism as Counterdiscourse* and Arif Dirlik's (1996) *Chinese History and the Question of Orientalism*. The Orientalist belief, as described and denaturalized by Said, is fundamentally a belief about the propriety of the uneven relations of power between colonizing and colonized peoples, specifically Occidental/Western European colonizers and Oriental/Eastern peoples. A central thrust of Said's critique is that this belief was historically leveraged by European colonial powers to justify their civilization and/or modernization missions in the regions now generally known as the Middle East and the Far East/Asia.

Some of the many social practices made seminal in the hierarchic Orientalist framing were language practices: English was often historically framed and valued as an integral part of the Occidental, colonizing modernism, which subsequently propagated a construction of English as not only Western but a "better" language. Being an English-speaking individual or nation – or more specifically, being socially recognized by those with power as the right kind of English-speaking individual or nation – was therefore an important factor in constructing and maintaining a hierarchic divide between West and East, although highlighting this role of English language in Orientalism is more our editorializing than Said's original priority.

Building upon Said's elucidation of this ideological divide, Dirlik's (1996: 97) essay quotes the following passage of Said's (1978) *Orientalism* which we, too, treated as a launching point:

> The relatively common denominator between [...] aspects of Orientalism is the line separating Occident from Orient and this [...] is less a fact of nature than it is a fact of

> human production, which I have called imaginative geography. This is, however, neither to say that the division between Orient and Occident is unchanging nor […] that it is simply fictional.

It is this construction of a dividing line – an *oppositional* East-West ideology – which interests us here. While the ideological constructions of "the Orient", "the Occident" and other East-West divisions change over time and across social situations, the underlying binary structure appears to us to still be nourished by language ideologies, even under conditions of globalization today.

In many formulations of this binary, there is an overlay of spatial and temporal ideologies: certain places become 'modern', others 'pre-modern', and the languages associated with each are likewise constructed within an epistemology of progress. Said argued that European Orientalism itself did analogous ideological work, and Dirlik (1996: 97) agrees that "[s]patial differences were thereby rendered into temporal differences, and different societies placed at different locations in a progressive temporality in which Euro-America stood for the epitome of progress". Yet while it is widely acknowledged in sociolinguistics that English is often constructed as an index of modernity (e.g. Piller 2007; Jaworski 2015), there has been relatively little research examining the ways in which the globalization of English accretes to, or disrupts, locally salient imbrications of spatial and temporal ideologies.

To develop upon the idea that the East and the West are not (only) geographic regions but ideological, oppositional concepts, as we have just introduced, we have drawn upon one other key influence, Chen (1992). We named this above as a work extending Said's critique of Orientalist ideology. Chen (1992: 708) observes that nation states, although seemingly fixed places, are "capable of being transplanted, with varying degrees of self-consciousness, to a great variety of social terrains, to merge and be merged with a correspondingly wide variety of political and ideological constellations". Following Chen and Dirlik, in this special issue we and our co-contributors are examining how the spatialised East and West ideologies are likewise transplanted and merged with language ideologies, within different localities in Asia.

Despite the two decades since Chen's (1992) and Dirlik's (1996) analyses, and their enduring perspicacity, there have been few sociolinguistic studies engaging with them, and even fewer engaging with their ideas on the heterogeneity of Easts and Wests or of

Orientalist ideological processes. However, we find their ideas to be generative of new and, in our view, needed, sociolinguistic scholarship. We have therefore asked our contributors, "How do dominant East-West binaries serve the production of socially salient language ideologies and social orders within Asia, at more specific and sub-national scales?". In addition, we also query, "Who produces East-West binary ideologies of language, in whose interests, and how?"

In discussing whether English can instead be Eastern or neither Western nor Eastern, for whom, and why, one could turn to many additional theorists and forebears, and indeed the range of sources drawn upon by our contributors and named below enriches the discussion. The body of literature known as World Englishes, within which similar questions are asked, has played a particular role for us. However, in asking how ideologies of language and other socially salient differences and hierarchies are constructed and reconstructed around the "imaginative geograph[ies]" (Dirlik 1996: 97) of "The East" and "The West", our concern is not quite the World Englishes concern of examining how English is spoken around the world. Rather, our concern is how speaking "English" is *or is not* believed to correspond to racial, geographic and other signs to create enduring and shared ideas of what the West is, of what the East is, of what locations on various scales are (e.g. the scales of Asia > China > urban China etc), and thus beliefs as to where a speaker of English is normatively placed.

What we have built upon from World Englishes is the challenge to the assumption that English is the language of the Western "other"; this assumption has been well observed and critiqued in research in the field of World Englishes (see e.g., Wee, Lim and Goh 2013; Park and Wee 2009, building upon the Quirk [1988, 1990] vs. Kachru [1998] debate). Specifically, we are building upon the World Englishes scholars' finding that a belief that English is inherently foreign and unable to form part of Asian identities is dominant and widely reproduced in political rhetoric (Park and Wee 2008: 250; 2009: 398). To illustrate, such discourses may reproduce the othering of Asian English speakers as "inauthentic" because people of X Asian nation or identity cannot be *both* authentic locals *and* speakers of this language which is naturalized as being "inherently" from the other, Western side of a divide. The World Englishes paradigm critiques this mapping of a West/East or Global North/South binary onto English/other languages by validating the ways English is spoken in places outside Europe, America and other English settler societies. We wish to take this further and in doing so, our special issue aligns with Park and Wee's (2009) reformulation of the canonical World Englishes's Three Circle Model as a model of language ideologies rather

than a descriptive taxonomies of Englishes. At the same time, it acknowledges Kachru's (1998) repositioning of English as the language not just *in* Asia but *of* Asia.

Moreover, beyond the World Englishes scholarship, sociolinguists have now developed robust critiques of the naturalization of language ideologies which empower some while disempowering others, especially those in the periphery (often, *further* disempowering them as linguistic marginality intersects with other forms of marginality). These, too, are part of the intellectual backdrop to this special issue. This scholarship includes fulsome critiques of the globalization of English (e.g., Canagarajah 1999; Hu and Alsagoff 2010; Pennycook 2014; Philipson 1992, 2003, 2009; Piller 2013; and Pennycook and Canagarajah's chapters within Ricento's 2000 topical compilation) and critiques of the belief that the optimal nation has citizens who only speak one language (Blommaert 2013; Woolard and Schieffelin 1994: 60; Piller's 2016 critique of Bauman and Briggs 2003).

Yet despite such scholarly critiques, the belief that English is inherently Western or owned by "the West" remains in plain sight. Of course, we do not claim that all the world believes that English is Western, but powerful, wide-reaching and amplified discourses both inside and outside of academia perpetuate the idea of English as inherently Western. Many readers will have heard their own governments' rhetoric on who counts as an English speaker, as part of discursive efforts to create in and out groups, claim language ownership or reject foreign interference/soft power. Illustrative examples constructing English as essentially foreign from outside academia, for instance in popular media and policy discourses, are presented within many of this special issue's contributions. Chen (this issue: X) quotes a memorable travelogue entitled "Know English, Will Travel," which reports on a Chinese tech entrepreneur who is thinking about building a "foreigners' city" in China: "We can build a mini-city peopled with foreign backpackers who can be encouraged to live like they do in their home countries. English will be the only language of communication. […] The Chinese can visit this 'city' and quickly improve their language skills," he is reported saying. This idea is similar to that which our contributors, Michiko Weinmann, Ryo Kanaizumi and Ruth Arber, report has already been executed by the Tokyo Metropolitan Government and Board of Education. They opened an English learning facility in 2018 called the Tokyo Global Gateway, also called *Eigo-mura* [The English Village], to support Tokyo students in "speaking English in daily life overseas" (Tokyo Metropolitan Board of Education 2017, cited in Weinmann et al. this issue: X).

These examples form part of a prevalent East-West binary propagated in global discourses which constructs a socially salient division between the Euro-American West and middle and far eastern Asian. Of course, not all relevant political, media and academic discourses will explicitly say "English is not Asian, English is Western": it is the various ways of producing and empowering the construction of English as Western, or challenging and reformulating such constructions, that our contributors delve into.

Moreover, while the recent decades of large-scale socio-economic changes in many Asian nations have shifted geopolitical power on the global scale, this does not mean that these oppositional East-West social constructions have become redundant. Rather, it has become increasingly important to understand the propagation and impact of such constructions in contemporary conditions now that the "insiders" of global power have come to include some non-European people and nations, which "arguably has contributed further to enhancing the power of the idea of modernization itself" (Dirlik 1996: 100), with English having become deeply and ideologically associated with modernization (Cho 2017). It is thus important even (more) now to explore how the marginalization of peoples and language practices according to pre-existing local socio-linguistic hierarchies are challenged or perhaps perpetuated by the globalization of English in Asia; there are socially-situated impacts of these binary and hierarchic global ideologies of English, modernity, nationhood and culture.

2. Outline of the Special Issue

2.1. Overall approach to diversity

Our overall argument is that the enclosed research reveals ideologies which challenge and re-arrange the conventional mapping of English onto an imagined West inherently in opposition to the East while upholding the oppositional structure, to the benefit of some. The *IJSL*, with its longstanding focus on language ideologies, has done more than many journals in providing similar studies which approach language ideologies and practices in specific Asian contexts from local perspectives, but there is yet room for more diversity in perspectives and locations. While the slowly-building body of work on language ideologies in Asia has so far focused on gender ideologies (e.g., Takahashi 2013) and market ideologies, specifically neoliberalism (e.g., Cho 2021; Gao and Park 2015; Park 2010, 2011; Piller and Cho 2013), our focus is on ideologies that question the traditional imagined West-East binary that maps English onto the imagined West and the languages in Asia onto the imagined East. Moreover, amongst the existing studies in Asian contexts relating to language ideologies, there have

been comparatively few pieces about Asian locations other than China (especially Hong Kong) and India. One notable exception is a recent special issue of this journal concerning South and Central Asia (Bolander and Mostowlansky 2017); we wish to extend the diversity that the *IJSL* presented in that issue. This is in part driven by the need to address imbalances of representation and authorship within academic publishing which has been recognized in recent decades in sociolinguistics, leading to calls for increased attention to "outer/emerging circle" studies and authors. It has been important to us as Guest Editors that this special issue represents many selves and others within Asia, and, to the extent possible, also be written in languages other than English (hence the bilingual abstracts).

Thus, we have invited Bolander to return here with further analysis of ideologies of English in Pakistan and Tajikistan. We seek to address the inexplicable rarity of Korean sociolinguistic research in Jinhyun Cho's contribution, a sociolinguistic history which should serve usefully as a basis for further studies of language ideologies in the Korean peninsula today and as background to reading Cho's (2017) book, *English Language Ideologies in Korea*, which we have invited Juyoung Song to review. Increasing the diversity of the literature, Weinmann et al. update us on current shifts in the sociolinguistic environment of Japan in relation to the Olympic and Paralympic Games which that nation would have hosted while this issue was in preparation had Covid-19 not forced a postponement. Finally, we have taken pains to include both a study concerning "mainstream" Chinese people (by Xiao Xiao Chen) and one concerning China's minority peoples, specifically Zhuang and Mongol people (by Alexandra Grey and Gegentuul Baioud). We have also included bilingual abstracts throughout. Our special issue is, therefore, part of a broader trend in recent years (in relation to which the IJSL has been *avant garde*) to produce sociolinguistic research about and from so-called global peripheries to rebalance the field. (The term "global peripheries" itself gained prominence in linguistics this century, which we attribute in no small part to Canagarajah's publications, e.g., Canagarajah [1999]; see also Pietikäinen et al. [2016]). Below, we canvass the language ideologies examined by these contributors then summarise each paper.

2.2. Shared theoretical bases

In critically reflecting on ideologies of English in Asia, our contributors are unified in seeking to identify and analyze recursive Orientalist ideologies, by which we mean ideologies which map international Orientalist hierarchies onto socially salient hierarchies on more local

scales, particularly in relation to language. To paraphrase Grey and Baioud (this issue: X), analyzing several layers of subalternity is crucial if we are to understand the way in which dominant East-West discourses are utilized on various levels in local contexts within Asia. In this special issue, the specific Orientalist ideologies under analysis include the following three.

First, Self-Orientalism: this is the self-implicating reproduction of a dominant and essentializing Oriental identity. This is the focus of our contributor, Chen, who draws on the terms' original proponent, Dirlik (1996), and it is also woven into Weinmann and her co-authors' contribution. Second, Internal Orientalism, which is the recursive ascription of a dominant and essentialising Oriental identity to marginalise co-ethnics. This is the focus of Grey and Baioud's contribution, following the coinage by Schein (2000). Third, Internal Colonialism, which is akin to internal Orientalism but with racial differentiation made salient. This is the focus of Cho's contribution, but also identified by Grey and Baioud (this issue: X) as a welcome future extension of their analysis.

Much as we have noted above that versions of Orientalism can be understood as recursive language ideologies re-mapping beliefs about an imagined West versus an imagined East onto different scales of geography and/or social grouping and/or linguistic difference, contemporary raciolinguistic theory understands recursive language ideologies as "internal colonialism involving the remapping of transnational colonial relations within a colonizing or previously colonized nation-state's borders" (Rosa and Flores 2017: 626). There is, in short, a useful parallel between this newer critical sociolinguistic theory and the late twentieth century's critical Orientalism (i.e., literature that denaturalizes Orientalism rather than reproducing it), in particular in examining how newer discursive configurations implicate internal colonialism.

Further, our contributors explore how these ideological processes can rely on the "complicity of 'orientals'" (Dirlik 1996: 100) as a "manifestation […of] newly-acquired power" (Dirlik 1996: 96), which Dirlik argued was an important, complex and yet under-examined aspect of critical Orientalism. For example, our first article (Cho this issue: XX), develops this inquiry into complicity. She does so through a vivid examination of the historic development of raciolinguistic self-subjugation using the diaries of a leading nineteenth century Korean-English interpreter from his fraught years in the USA. Grey and Baioud (this issue: XX) explore the production of similar Internal Orientalist hierarchies within China, within which ascription to majority and minority language groupings are seminal. Then Chen

(this issue: XX) takes our focus to a related complicity, revealing the discursive construction of Self-Orientalism in present-day travelogues about China. As power structures change, ideologies about what or whom are valuable and "naturally" more powerful must change. Thus, in assembling our contributors, we were guided by an expectation that the enormous social, cultural, economic and political shifts within Asian countries and internationally in relation to them will have engendered adaptions to, new complicities in, or even the fading away of Orientalist (and other) ideologies. However, how these ideologies have changed in relation to language has remained under-examined over the last two decades, especially in sociolinguistic scholarship about Asia.

2.3. Shared methodological bases

This special issue's contributors also share a methodological orientation. We are all basically asking whose discourses link "English" (however constructed) to which models of personhood (including the ethnic, racial and autochthonous/migrant aspects of personhood), and what are the vested interests in these constructions, given "no discursive practice is ever free from a will to power" (Chen 1992: 709). Answering these sorts of questions lends itself well to emic and ethnographically-oriented approaches, as each contributor to this special issue took.

2.4. Article summaries

The first answer in this issue comes from Korea. An imagined geography of America has been central to how Korea itself has been imagined since the 18th century, but the racialized personhoods of the Korean speaker and the English speaker have prevented the legitimate and full ownership of English by Koreans, as Cho's intimate sociolinguistic history of self-Orientalism in this issue shows. Cho's analysis reconceptualises Self-Orientalism as a process of Bourdieusian *méconnaissance* ("misrecognition": Bourdieu 1989) born out of a 19th and early 20th century colonial context. Race, gender and class are oftentimes co-constructed; Cho's take on East-West ideologies of English in Korea brings forth spatial and racial dimensions that run quietly through the previous works on English and gender or economic ideology in Asia (examples cited above). Her use of diary data brings forth bottom-up approaches from a time other than our own, using them to explore a prominent, early Korean interpreter's changing participation in and reproduction of Easts and Wests,

particularly an English-speaking (Korean) East and a Korean West, both of which he sought to identify with but ultimately ceased to imagine for himself or for his community.

Cho's contribution and the next two in the special issue, which are our two contributions about China, explicitly take up Dirlik's (1996) work, which we introduced as a key theoretical inheritance of this special issue, above. Cho highlights misrecognition of the binary system between the "superior" West and the "inferior" East as a reason behind the continued presence of a raciolinguistic demarcation, arguing that because English is so dominantly associated with an (American) West, it has continuously been misrecognized as a key medium through which to become part of the imagined community desired by Korean "Orientals" who want to distinguish themselves from what they perceived as an inferior community. Cho (this issue: X) thus argues that Self-Orientalism is "now and here", in line with the key argument of Dirlik (1996, 2002) that we – at least we in Asia – continue to live in conditions of coloniality. (For further discussion relating to the "particular" relationship that Dirlik [2002: 428] emphasizes between "modern colonialism" and capitalism, in relation to English, see [Piller and Cho 2013].)

Moreover, Grey and Baioud's contribution argues that internal colonialism is happening now within China (as Dirlik himself notes in so many words in relation to Tibet [2002: 439]), in addition to there being a sort of coloniality in China resulting from informal European/American/Western colonialism. (Grey [2021: 285] also takes up this issue.) Further, Grey and Baioud's contribution acknowledges the prominence nowadays in China of nationalism in ideologies about Mandarin, English and official minority languages. On the point of nationalism, Dirlik (2002: 428) suggests that any construction of nationalism is "a version of colonialism". As both authors and editors, we have neither sought to affirm nor to gainsay that specific claim in this special issue; our primary concern, outlined above, is rather to use Dirlik's 1996 theorization of oppositional imagined geographies and complicity in Orientalism to analyse afresh the spread of English language in Asia. However, we will comment that Grey and Baioud (and many studies beyond this journal) pose a challenge to the claim: they affirm that nationalism generally and a Mandarin-centered nationalism specifically are ascendant in China. But China has never been formally colonized by European or American powers. So what specific colonization is Chinese linguistic nationalism a version of? While this question is not the primary theme of this special issue, we mention it as worthy of attention by scholars whose research seeks to build on the articles herein. As a starting point for answering, Dirlik (2002: 441) himself warns against

"confus[ing] the colonialism of independent 'colonists' with state-sponsored and [state]-directed colonialism". In a different partial answer, Grey (2017, 2021) and Mullaney (2006, 2011) trace the intellectual history of linguistic nationalism in China to both European and Soviet conceptions of nations in addition to its long history within imperial China, providing a foundation for an argument that linguistic nationalism in China today is be structured by ideas and processes of colonization without direct, foreign colonization having occurred.

Overall, Cho and our other contributors' engagement with Dirlik's work aligns with his position that there is ongoing and varied coloniality rather than "post" colonialism. We see this special issue's contributions as showing variations of this reality: neither coloniality itself nor its intersection with English language is experienced the same way everywhere in Asia. And our starting point – the dominant, globalized constructions of an East-West hierarchy that maps onto language – are a form of the mercurial, globalized, Euro-American "modern colonialism" about which Dirlik writes. Confident that other scholars have and will continue to foreground the aspects of Dirlik's work that we cannot foreground within this special issue – *no* special issue could engage fully with every aspect of the theoretical inheritance which we have outlined above – we now return to summarizing the contributions.

Minoritized people's experiences are foregrounded, for instance, in the second contribution. Grey and Baioud discuss how, from their two investigations of minority perspectives on English in China, an Orientalist hierarchic division is mapped onto an ethno-linguistic majority-minority divide. Through this comparison of their individual studies in the north and south reaches of the nation, Grey and Baioud find that binary East-West ideologies are reproduced but *not* necessarily as Foreign language-Local language ideologies. Rather, English and Mandarin *both* become constructed languages of East China which further marginalizes minority languages. Differing intersections between language ideologies and gender ideologies are also discussed. Finally, Grey and Baioud argue that hierarchically ordered ideologies relegating the Zhuang and Mongolian minority languages are sometimes agentively and artistically negotiated, following Agha's (2007) theoretical predication of the stylized and reactive usage of enregistered signs. That is, despite minority languages being further marginalized through a double domination of the Mandarin and English affiliated with the richer, more urbanized East of China, Mongolian speakers (and to a lesser extent, Zhuang speakers) are constructing their own bottom-up 'modern minority' identities incorporating certain minority language practices.

In our second contribution about China, Chen examines representational self-Orientalism from a majority people's perspective in China. She makes a critical discourse analysis of travelogues from a contemporary Chinese newspaper which continually reproduce and naturalise English as out of place in China, for the benefit of a foreign, Anglophone readership. This study was designed in response to Thurlow and Jaworski's (2010) identification of a dearth of critical analyses regarding metadiscourses of English language in sociolinguistic studies of tourism. As noted above, Chen draws out the Self-Orientalism in travelogues about China from a Chinese newspaper, building this special issue's interrogation of Orientalist complicity in language ideologies about English. This contribution further shows the dynamic, continual re-construction yet perpetual binary of which languages are in place, for whom, in "the East".

Then Bolander's contribution uses a "discourse analysis beyond the speech event approach" (Wortham and Reyes 2015) and innovatively fuses the familiar sociolinguistic theory of heteroglossia (Bakhtin 1981) with less familiar (we expect) theories of religion in order to explore how English becomes indexical of Ismaili distinction in local communities in Pakistan and Tajikistan. Bolander finds that English is appropriated as an index of Ismaili Muslim transnationalism in Pakistan and Tajikistan, in a process which complicates questions of ownership and challenges understandings of English as foreign, Western and Christian.

We hear similar narratives about the local ownership of and identification with English from English teachers and teacher educators in Japan, despite the persistent construction of English as Western by education policy, including the new policies about English language education in preparation for Japan hosting the 2020 Olympics and Paralympics, in Weinmann et al.'s contribution. In highlighting these bottom-up constructions of Easts and Wests and contrasting it to top-down English education policy discourses, Weinmann et al.'s intention is to add to a body of work addressing the theory and practice divide in English language teaching (ELT) following Galloway and Rose (2015: 259), who have established that this is a divide of concern not only in Japan but around the world.

We will publish short blog posts about these contributions on the peer-reviewed research website Language on the Move (www.languageonthemove.com, see it reviewed in Nylund [2018]), and we encourage readers to continue the discussion of ideologies of English in Asia in the blogs' comments, in whichever language you prefer. Our hope is that the approach of this special issue generates new and useful sociolinguistic analyses, whether

further examining how diverse, socially constructed East-West oppositions are interacting with racial and Orientalist ideologies and with language ideologies about English in the places we have focused on – Korea, China, Japan, Tajikistan and Pakistan – or examining an extended range of places and languages.

Acknowledgments

We thank the general editors of the IJSL for their intellectual engagement and guidance in writing this editorial, as well as the Language on the Move Reading Group for the discussions and enduring collaborative relationships that have underpinned this special issue.

Bibliography

Agha, Asif. 2007. *Language and Social Relations.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Anderson, Benedict. 1991. *Imagined communities: reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism.* London: Verso.

Bakhtin, Mikhail Mikhaĭlovich. 1981. *The dialogic imagination: Four essays* (C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Trans.). Austin: University of Texas.

Bauman, Richard, Charles L. Briggs, and Charles S. Briggs. 2003. *Voices of Modernity: Language Ideologies and the Politics of Inequality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Blommaert, Jan. 2013 Language and the Study of Diversity, *Tilburg Papers in Cultural Studies* 74.

Bolander, Brook & Till Mostowlansky (eds.). 2017. Language and globalization in South and Central Asian spaces. [Special issue]. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* (247).

Bolton, Kingsley. 2000. The sociolinguistics of Hong Kong and the space for Hong Kong English. *World Englishes* 19(3). 265–286.

Bolton, Kingsley. 2008. English in Asia, Asian Englishes, and the issue of proficiency. *English Today* 24(2). 3–12.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1989. The state nobility. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Canagarajah, Suresh. 1999. *Resisting Linguistic Imperialism in English Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Canagarajah, Suresh. 2000. Negotiating Ideologies through English: Strategies from the Periphery. In Thomas Ricento (ed.), *Ideology, politics and language policies: Focus on English* 121–132. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Chen, Xiaomei. 1992. Occidentalism as Counterdiscourse: "He Shang" in Post-Mao China. *Critical Inquiry* 18(Summer). 686–712.

Cho, Jinhyun. 2017. *English language ideologies in Korea: interpreting the past and present.* Cham: Springer.

Cho, Jinhyun. 2021. Neoliberalism and the global spread of English: A Korean case. In Britta Schneider and Theresa Heyd (Eds.), *Bloomsbury World Englishes* (vol. 1), London: Bloomsbury Publishing.

Dirlik, Arif. 1996. Chinese History and the Question of Orientalism. *History and Theory* 35(4). 96–118.

Dirlik, Arif. 2002. Rethinking Colonialism: Globalization, Postcolonialism, and The Nation. *Interventions* 4(3). 428-448.

Galloway, Nicola & Heath Rose. 2015. *Introducing global Englishes*. New York: Routledge.

Gao, Yihong. 2009. Sociocultural contexts and English in China. In Joseph Lo Bianco, Jane Orton & Yihong Gao (eds.), *China and English: globalization and the dilemmas of identity*, 57–78. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Gao, Shuang and Park, Joseph S.Y. 2015. Space and language learning under the neoliberal economy. *L2 Journal* 7(3). 78–96.

Grey, Alexandra. 2017. *How do language rights affect minority languages in China? An ethnographic investigation of the Zhuang minority language under conditions of rapid social change*. Sydney: Macquarie University PhD thesis.

Grey, Alexandra. 2021. *Language Rights in a Changing China: A National Overview and Zhuang Case Study*. Boston: De Gruyter.

Hu, Guangwei & Alsagoff, Lubna 2010. A public policy perspective on English medium instruction in China. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 31(4). 365–382.

Hung, Tony T.N. 2002. English as a global language: Implications for teaching. *The ACELT Journal* 6(2). 3–10.

Irvine, Judith & Susan Gal. 2000. Language ideology and linguistic differentiation. In Paul V. Kroskrity (ed.), *Regimes of language: ideologies, polities, and identities* 35–83. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.

Jaworski, Adam. 2015. Globalese: a new visual-linguistic register. *Social Semiotics* 25(2). 217–235.

Kachru, Braj B. 1998. English as an Asian language. *Links & Letters* 5. 89–108.

Kirkpatrick, Andy. 2018. English in Multilingual Settings: Features, Roles and Implications. In Isabel P. Martin (ed.), *Reconceptualizing English Education in a Multilingual Society: English in the Philippines*, 15–28. Singapore: Springer.

Kirkpatrick, Andy. 2010. *English as a lingua franca in ASEAN: A multilingual model.* Aberdeen, Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Kirkpatrick, Andy. 2008. English as the official working language of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN): Features and strategies. *English Today* 24(2). 27–34.

Mullaney, Thomas. 2006. *Coming to terms with the nation: Ethnic classification and scientific statecraft in modern China, 1928–1954*. New York: Columbia University PhD thesis.

Mullaney, Thomas. 2011. *Coming to terms with the nation: Ethnic classification in modern China* (Asia: Local Studies / Global Themes 18). Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Nylund, Anastasia. 2018. Blog: Language on the Move. www.languageonthemove.com. ISSN 2203 - 5001 [Review]. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 22(4). 470–473.

Park, Joseph S.Y. 2010. Naturalization of competence and the neoliberal subject: Success stories of English language learning in the Korean conservative press. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 20(1). 22–38.

Park, Joseph S.Y. 2011. The promise of English: Linguistic capital and the neoliberal worker in the South Korean job market. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 14(4). 443–455.

Park, Joseph S.Y. & Lionel H. Wee. 2008. Appropriating the language of the other: Performativity in autonomous and unified markets. *Language & Communication* 28. 242–257.

Park, Joseph S.Y. & Lionel H. Wee. 2009. The three circles redux: a market–theoretic perspective on World Englishes. *Applied Linguistics* 30(3). 389–406.

Pennycook, Alastair. 2000. Language, Ideology and Hindsight: Lessons from Colonial Language Policies. In Thomas Ricento (ed.), *Ideology, politics and language policies: Focus on English* 49–65. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Pennycook, Alastair. 2014. *The Cultural Politics of English as an International Language* (Vol. 2). London and New York: Routledge.

Phillipson, Robert. 1992. *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Phillipson, Robert. 2003. *English-only Europe? Challenging language policy*. London: Routledge.

Phillipson, Robert. 2009. *Linguistic Imperialism Continued.* New York and London: Routledge.

Pietikäinen, Sari, Alexandra Jaffe, Helen Kelly-Holmes & Nikolas Coupland. 2016. *Sociolinguistics from the Periphery: Small Languages in New Circumstances.* Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.

Piller, Ingrid. 2007. English in Swiss tourism marketing. In C. Flores & O. Grossegesse (Eds.), *Wildern in luso-austro-deutschen Sprach- und Textgefilden: Festschrift zum 60. Geburtstag von Erwin Koller [Roughing it in the linguistic and textual wilds of Portuguese, Austrian and German: Festschrift for Erwin Koller on the occasion of his 60th birthday]* 57–73. Braga: Cehum Centro de Estudos Humanísticos.

Piller, Ingrid. 2013. English is Excellence. *Language on the Move* (26 November 2013) https://www.languageonthemove.com/english-is-excellence/ (accessed 13 January 2021).

Piller, Ingrid. 2016. Herder: an explainer for linguists. *Language on the Move* (4 March 2016) https://www.languageonthemove.com/herder-an-explainer-for-linguists/ (accessed 13 January 2021).

Piller, Ingrid & Jinhyun Cho. 2013. Neoliberalism as language policy. *Language in Society* 42(1): 23–44.

Quirk, Randolph. 1988. The question of standards in the international use of English. In Peter Lowenberg (ed.), *Language spread and language policy: issues, implications and case studies (GURT, 1987).* 229–241. Washington DC: Georgetown University Press.

Quirk, Randolph. 1990. Language varieties and standard language. *English Today* 6(1). 3–10.

Thomas Ricento (ed.) 2000. *Ideology, politics and language policies: Focus on English.* Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Rosa, Jonathan & Nelson Flores. 2017. Unsettling race and language: Toward a raciolinguistic perspective. *Language in Society* 46(5). 621–647.

Said, Edward. 1978. *Orientalism (1st ed).* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Schein, Louisa. 2000. *Minority rules: The Miao and the feminine in China's cultural politics*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Takahashi, Kimie. 2013. *Language learning, gender, and desire*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Thurlow, Crispin & Jaworski, Adam. 2010. *Tourism discourse: Language and global mobility*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Tupas, Ruanni 2016. English, neocolonialism and forgetting. In Pauline Bunce, Robert Phillipson, Vaughan Rapatahana, & Ruanni Tupas (eds.), *Why English? Confronting English*, 47-58. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Tupas, Ruanni. 2008. Bourdieu, historical forgetting, and the problem of English in the Philippines. *Philippine Studies* 56(1). 47–67.

Tupas, Ruanni. 2004. The politics of Philippine English: neo-colonialism, global politics, and the problem of postcolonialism. *World English* 23(1). 47–58.

Wee, Lionel H., Lisa Lim & Robbie B.H. Goh. 2013. Conclusion. In Lionel H. Wee, Robbie B.H. Goh & Lisa Lim (eds.), *The Politics of English in Asia: Language Policy and Cultural Expression in South and Southeast Asia and the Asia Pacific*, 303–316. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Woolard, Kathryn A. & Bambi B. Schieffelin. 1994. Language ideology. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 23. 55-82

Wortham, Stanton & Angela Reyes. 2015. *Discourse analysis beyond the speech event*. London & New York: Routledge.